



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,438	11/14/2001	David Botstein	10466/201	2374
35489 7590 06/25/2008 GOODWIN PROCTER LLP 135 COMMONWEALTH DRIVE MENLO PARK, CA 94025				
EXAMINER KAUFMAN, CLAIRE M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1646				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/25/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/990,438  
Filing Date: November 14, 2001  
Appellant(s): BOTSTEIN ET AL.

---

James A. Fox  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed April 23, 2008, appealing from the Office action mailed October 18, 2007.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The Examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal directed to a polypeptide referred to as PRO290. However, there are other applications by the same assignee relying upon the gene amplification assay for utility which are under similar rejections and/or appeals.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The Appellants' statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is deficient. 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v) requires the summary of claimed subject matter to include: (1) a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters and (2) for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function as permitted by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, must be identified and the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function must be set forth with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters. The brief is deficient for two reasons: 1) On page 3 of the brief it states in lines 2-3 that the limitation of amplification in human lung and colon cancers as compared to

Art Unit: 1646

normal noncancerous human tissue controls is specifically recited in Claim 124, and carried by all claims dependent from Claim 124; and 2) On page 3 of the brief it states in lines 4-5 that there is claimed the amino acid sequence of the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:33 “lacking its associated signal-peptide”. First, there is no limitation in any claim relating to amplification in any cancer. Second, there is not limitation in any claim wherein the polypeptide is “lacking its associated signal-peptide”. The specification discloses SEQ ID NO:33 as the full-length PRO290 polypeptide (*e.g.*, p. 340, lines 15-16).

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The Appellants’ statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

Konopka et al. "Variable Expression of the Translocated c-abl Oncogene in Philadelphia-Chromosome-Positive B-Lymphoid Cell Lines from Chronic Myelogenous Leukemia Patients" Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, vol83 (1986), pp. 4049-4052.

Pennica et al. "WISP Genes Are Members of the Connective Tissue Growth Factor Family That Are Up-Regulated in WNT-1-Transformed Cells and Aberrantly Expressed in Human Colon Tumors" Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, vol95 (1998), pp. 14717-14722.

Godbout et al. "Overexpression of a DEAD Box Protein (DDX1) in Neuroblastoma and Retinoblastoma Cell Lines" J. Biol. Chem. vol273, no33 (14 August 1998), pp. 21161-21168.

Li et al. "Identification of Putative Oncogenes in Lung Adenocarcinoma by a Comprehensive Functional Genomic Approach" Oncogene, vol25 (2006), pp. 2628-2635.

Sen, S. "Aneuploidy and Cancer" Curr. Opin. Oncol., vol12 (2000), pp. 82-88.

Hittleman, W.N. "Genetic Instability in Epithelial Tissues at Risk for Cancer" Ann. NY Acad. Sci., vol952 (2001), pp. 1-12.

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 124-125 and 129-131 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

Claims 124-125 and 129-131 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth here, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

The claims are directed to isolated polypeptides comprising an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 33, also known as PRO290, or the amino acid sequence of the full-length coding sequence of the cDNA deposited under ATCC accession number 209790. It is noted that the specification asserts several utilities for the claimed polypeptides other than as a marker for lung or colon tumors, all of which have been found to be non-specific and/or insubstantial. For discussion of these utilities, see Office action mailed 19 October 2005. However, these asserted utilities will not be readdressed here due to Appellants' indication that they are relying upon the gene amplification assay for utility and enablement.

At pages 539-555 of the specification, Example 170 discloses a gene amplification assay in which genomic DNA encoding PRO290 had a  $\Delta Ct$  value of at least 1.22-2.07 for 5/19 lung tumor samples and 1.16 and 1.56 for 2/17 colon tumor samples. Example 170 asserts that gene amplification is associated with overexpression of the gene product (*i.e.*, the polypeptide), indicating that the polypeptides are useful targets for therapeutic intervention in cancer and diagnostic determination of the presence of cancer (p. 539, lines 21-24). At page 545,  $\Delta Ct$  is defined as the threshold PCR cycle, or the cycle at which the reporter signal accumulates above the background level of fluorescence. The specification further indicates that  $\Delta Ct$  is used as "a quantitative measurement of the relative number of starting copies of a particular target sequence in a nucleic acid sample when comparing cancer DNA results to normal human DNA results." At page 548, it is stated that samples are used if their values are within 1 Ct of the 'normal standard'. It is further noted that the  $\Delta Ct$  values at pages 550-554 are expressed (a) with values to one one-hundredth of a unit (e.g. 1.22), and (b) that very few values were obtained that were at least 2.

While these data are pertinent to utility and enablement of PRO290 *genomic DNA* for use in lung or colon tumor diagnosis, the data do not directly bear on the utility of the claimed PRO290 *polypeptides*. It is noted that the amplification in lung or colon tumors of the nucleic acid encoding the PRO299 polypeptide is not an activity of the polypeptide, but rather a

characteristic of a nucleic acid. In order for PRO290 polypeptides to be overexpressed in tumors, amplified genomic DNA would have to correlate with increased mRNA levels and, subsequently, increased polypeptide levels. No data regarding PRO290 mRNA or PRO290 polypeptide levels in lung or colon tumors have been brought forth on the record. The art discloses that a correlation between genomic DNA levels and mRNA levels cannot be presumed. Regarding the correlation between genomic DNA amplification and increased mRNA expression, Pennica et al. (1998, PNAS USA 95:14717-14722, previously of record), disclose that:

“An analysis of *WISP-1* gene amplification and expression in human colon tumors showed a correlation between DNA amplification and overexpression, whereas overexpression of *WISP-3* RNA was seen in the absence of DNA amplification. In contrast, *WISP-2* DNA was amplified in the colon tumors, but its mRNA expression was significantly reduced in the majority of tumors compared with the expression in normal colonic mucosa from the same patient.” (p. 14722, second paragraph of left column)

Additional details are provided in the section entitled, “Amplification and Aberrant Expression of *WISPs* in Human Colon Tumors” on pp. 14720-14721. See also Konopka et al. (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. (1986) 83:4049-4052, previously of record), who state in the abstract that, “Protein expression is not related to amplification of the *abl* gene but to variation in the level of *bcr-abl* mRNA produced from a single Ph1 template.”

Godbout et al. (J. Biol. Chem 273(33):21161, 1998) teaches in the abstract that, “The DEAD box gene, DDX1, is a putative RNA helicase that is co-amplified with MYCN in a subset of retinoblastoma (RB) and neuroblastoma (NB) tumors and cell lines. Although gene amplification usually involves hundreds to thousands of kilobase pairs of DNA, a number of studies suggest that co-amplified genes are only overexpressed if they provide a selective advantage to the cells in which they are amplified.” The protein encoded by the DDX gene had been characterized as being a putative RNA helicase, a type of enzyme that would be expected to confer a selective advantage to the cells in which it (the DDX gene) was amplified. On page 21167, right column, first full paragraph, Godbout et al. state:

It is generally accepted that co-amplified genes are not over-expressed unless they provide a selective growth advantage to the cell (48, 49).” For example, although ERBA is closely linked to ERBB2 in breast cancer and both genes are commonly amplified in these tumors, ERBA is not overexpressed (48). Similarly, three genes mapping to 12q13-14 (CDK4, SAS and MDM2) are overexpressed in a high percentage of malignant gliomas showing amplification of this chromosomal region, while other genes mapping to this region (GADD153, GL1, and A2MR) are rarely overexpressed in gene-amplified malignant gliomas (50, 51). The first three genes are probably the main targets of the amplification process, while the latter three genes are probably incidentally included in the amplicons.

On the contrary, there is no structure/function analysis in the specification regarding the putative protein encoded by the PRO290 gene. It is not disclosed, and based upon the sequence searches in this case the Examiner can not find any reason to suspect, that the protein encoded by the PRO290 gene would confer any selective advantage on a cell expressing it. It has no known homology to an RNA helicase or any other protein that would be expected to confer a selective advantage to a tumor cell. Therefore, one of skill in the art would *not* expect PRO290 overexpression even if the genomic DNA is amplified. Further, it could not be determined whether the level of genomic amplification of the DDX1 gene was comparable to that disclosed for PRO290.

An additional reference that provides evidence that gene amplification does not necessarily lead to increased transcript is Li et al., *Oncogene*, Vol. 25, pages 2628-2635, 2006. Li et al. used a functional approach that integrated simultaneous genomic and transcript microarray, proteomics, and tissue microarray analyses to directly identify putative oncogenes in lung adenocarcinoma. On page 2633, paragraph beginning at the bottom of col. 1, Li et al. state:

Although the main focus of this study was to specifically identify putative oncogenes, it should be noted that 90.7% of the genes showing high protein expression did not show corresponding increases in both DNA copy number and transcript, a finding consistent with that of others that transcriptional, translational, and post-translational regulatory mechanisms can greatly influence the abundance of protein in lung tumorigenesis (Chen *et al.*, 2002)... In our study, 68.8% of the genes showing over-representation in the genome did not show elevated transcript levels, implying that at least some of these genes are 'passenger' genes that are concurrently amplified because of their location with respect to amplicons but lack biological relevance in terms of the development of lung adenocarcinoma.



The findings of Li et al. are that over half of the genes which were amplified were not overexpressed at the mRNA level. These findings show one cannot reasonably conclude that genomic amplification correlates with elevated mRNA levels.

While the Examiner has the resources to cite only a handful of references showing the unpredictability of a correlation between genomic DNA and protein levels, these references stand to show that one cannot make assumptions about the use of PRO290 polypeptide in view of the methods used and information provided in the instant specification. Data pertaining to PRO290 genomic DNA do not indicate anything significant regarding the claimed PRO290 polypeptides. Neither the data nor the art support the specification's assertion that PRO290 polypeptides can be used as a cancer diagnostic agent. Significant further research would have been required of the skilled artisan to reasonably confirm that the claimed PRO290 polypeptide is overexpressed in any cancer to the extent that it could be used as a cancer diagnostic agent, and thus the asserted utility is not substantial. In the absence of information regarding whether or not PRO290 polypeptide levels are also different between specific cancerous and corresponding normal tissues, the proposed use of the PRO290 *polypeptides* as diagnostic markers and therapeutic targets are simply starting points for further research and investigation into potential practical uses of the polypeptides. See *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 U.S.P.Q. 689 (Sup. Ct., 1966), wherein the court held that:

"The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility", "[u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where specific benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field", and "a patent is not a hunting license", "[i]t is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion."

In view of the preponderance of evidence supporting the rejections (Pennica et al., Konopka et al., Godbout et al., and Li et al., all of which are of record and have been previously discussed), the rejections are proper.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

At pages 4-5 and 9 of Appellants' brief, it is argued that the data in Example 170 (starting at p. 539 of the specification) describes results of a gene amplification assay. Appellants characterize the assay as being capable of quantitatively measuring the level of gene amplification in a sample. Appellants report that the gene encoding PRO290 was significantly amplified (2.297-fold to 4.2-fold) in 5/19 lung tumors. This has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. First, it is important to note that the gene encoding PRO290 was found not to be amplified in 14 out of 19 lung tumors (6/11 SqCCa-type tumors) and 15/17 colon tumor samples. Also, matched tissue samples were not used for controls. Rather, the control DNA appears to have been isolated from blood (bottom of p.547 of the specification). The art uses matched tissue samples as the standard in such cases (see Pennica et al., Konopka et al.). This is especially important in lung, since the art shows that both cancerous and non-cancerous lung tissue can be aneuploidy (see, e.g., Sen et al., J. Biol. Chem. 273(33):21161-21168, 1998, and Hittelman et al., Ann N.Y. Acad. Sci 952:1-12, 2001, previously cited). Given these details, one skilled in the art would not conclude that the gene encoding PRO290 would be useful as a cancer diagnostic or a target for cancer drug development, but would rather view the data as preliminary results. Furthermore, the data pertaining to gene amplification do not convey utility to the claimed polypeptides, since amplification in genomic DNA is shown in the art to fail to correlate with a corresponding increase in mRNA or polypeptide levels (see Pennica et al., Konopka et al., Godbout et al. and Li et al.).

Appellants argue (p. 4, lower half of p. 10, top of p. 13, bottom of p.15 through p.17) that ample evidence has been provided to show that, in general, if a gene is amplified in cancer, it is more likely than not that the corresponding mRNA and encoded polypeptide are also expressed at an elevated level. Appellants refer to Orntoft et al., Hyman et al. and Pollack et al. as teaching that, in general, gene amplification increases mRNA expression. Additionally, it is argued that Hyman et al. and Pollack et al. did not use traditional CGH analysis to identify amplified genes, while they did analyzed copy number on a gene-by-gene basis. These arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive. Orntoft et al. looked at increased DNA content

over large regions of chromosomes and compared that to mRNA and polypeptide levels from the chromosomal region (see for example, p 44, last paragraph of col. 1). Their approach to investigating gene copy number was termed CGH. Orntoft et al. do not appear to look at gene amplification, mRNA levels and polypeptide levels from a single gene at a time. The instant specification reports data regarding amplification of individual genes, which may or may not be in a chromosomal region which is highly amplified. Orntoft et al. concentrated on regions of chromosomes with clusters of chromosomal material containing strong gains, but it is not known whether PRO290 is in a gene cluster in a region of a chromosome that is highly amplified, which is pertinent because Orntoft et al. only provide information about genes in clusters (large chromosomal regions). The data of Orntoft et al. are not from looking at a 1:1 correspondence of genomic DNA and the mRNA which is transcribed from it. If PRO290 is not part of a cluster showing strong gains, then the findings of Orntoft et al. are not applicable. Because no such information was disclosed for PRO290, Orntoft et al. does not support Appellants' position. Orntoft et al. go on to say that detection was very limited.

While Hyman et al. and Pollack et al. combined CGH with microarray analysis, the results do not support a conclusion that the skilled artisan would reasonably expect amplified genomic DNA to correspond with overexpression of encoded protein. Hyman et al. used CGH in combination with cDNA microarray analysis. Less than half (44%) of *highly* amplified genes showed mRNA overexpression, and 10.5% of highly overexpressed transcripts had amplified genes (p. 6242, col. 1, third full paragraph). Thus, even at the level of high amplification and high overexpression, the two do not usually correlate. Polypeptide levels were not investigated. Further, Hyman et al. state that of the 12,000 transcripts analyzed, a set of 270 was identified in which overexpression was attributed to gene amplification (col. 1, middle, p. 6244). This proportion was about 2% of the total. The Examiner maintains that 2% does not provide a reasonable expectation that the amplification of PRO290 would be correlated with elevated levels of mRNA, much less polypeptide. Since Hyman et al. found that less than half of the amplified genes were overexpressed at the mRNA level, the references supports the basis of the rejections that it is more likely than not that gene amplification fails to correlate with increased mRNA/polypeptide levels. Therefore, Hyman et al. also do not support utility of the claimed polypeptides. Pollack et al. concentrated on large chromosome regions showing high

amplification (p. 12965). Pollack et al. did not investigate polypeptide levels. Pollack et al. also noted contradictory results found by another research group, Platzter et al., who found a poor correlation between DNA amplification and overexpression (p. 12967, col. 2, 7 lines from bottom). Pollack et al. noted that, "Alternatively, the contrasting findings for amplified genes may represent real biological differences between breast and metastatic colon tumors; resolution of this issue will require further studies" (p. 12968, end of first paragraph). This leads again to the issue of unpredictability, particularly when gene amplification of the instant PRO290 gene has been identified in lung and colon cancer instead of breast tumors.

Appellants argue (paragraph bridging pages 4-5 and pages 18-19) that even if there were no correlation between gene amplification and mRNA/protein expression, a polypeptide encoded by a gene that is amplified in cancer still has a patentable utility in that it yields more accurate tumor classification and provides significant information for cancer diagnosis and treatment, relying upon the declaration by Dr. Ashkenzi (submitted 08/20/04) and the "real world" example of breast cancer marker HER-2/neu of Hanna et al. reference. Appellants assert that the Examiner has misread Hanna et al., who state gene amplification and polypeptide expression are well correlated, with only a subset of tumors showing disagreement between the two measurements. Finally, Appellants conclude that there is generally a good correlation between gene amplification, mRNA levels and polypeptide levels, and thus the gene amplification data for PRO290 conveys utility to the claimed PRO290 polypeptides. These arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive. While it may be true that lack of overexpression of a gene product may also provide useful information in tumor categorization, the specification does not disclose such further testing of PRO290 gene product expression levels to facilitate categorization. Therefore, the skilled artisan would have been required to do the testing. In view of such requirement, the products based on the claimed invention are not in "currently available" form. Furthermore, the specification provides no assertion that the claimed PRO290 polypeptides are useful in tumor categorization, nor does it provide guidance regarding what treatment modalities should be selected by a physician depending upon whether or not a tumor overexpresses PRO290. This is also further experimentation that would have to be performed by the skilled artisan, indicating that the asserted utility is not substantial. Finally, Hanna et al. supports the rejection in that Hanna et al. show that gene amplification does not

reliably correlate with polypeptide overexpression, and thus the level of polypeptide expression must be tested empirically. Hanna et al. say these tests are used more or less independently, with the protein test used first, followed by the gene test if the protein test is negative (col. 2, third full paragraph). The protein test is only necessary to determine the appropriateness of antibody therapy. Also, it is stated in the same paragraph that “In general, FISH [gene] and IHC[protein] results correlate well. However, subsets of tumors are found which show discordant results; i.e., protein overexpression without gene amplification or lack of protein overexpression with gene amplification. The clinical significance of such results is unclear.” This teaches away from using gene amplification in cancer diagnosis or treatment. The identification of subsets of tumors without correlation affirms the unpredictability of the findings. Therefore, the issues of HER-2 cannot be generalized to any gene expressed in a tumor. The specification does not provide this further information, and thus the skilled artisan must perform additional experiments to reasonably confirm the real world context of the asserted utility. Since the asserted utility for the claimed polypeptides is not in currently available form, the asserted utility is not substantial. Again, because Hanna et al. studied breast cancer, the warning by Pollack et al. discussed in the preceding paragraph relating to the disparity in correlation of gene amplification and expression in breast compared to colon tumors is significant.

At pages 5 and 16 of the brief, Appellants note that the sale of gene expression chips to measure mRNA levels is a highly successful business. Appellants conclude that the research community believes that the information obtained from the chips is useful (*i.e.*, that it is more likely than not that the results are informative for protein levels). This has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. Evidence of commercial success, while probative as a secondary consideration of non-obviousness, has no bearing on the legal issue of utility and enablement. Additionally, because the gene chips are used to determine whether mRNA levels are predictive of polypeptide levels, which is not directly at issue here.

Appellants argue (p. 6) “that tests evidencing pharmacological activity of a compound may establish practical utility, even though they may not establish a specific therapeutic use.” This statement relates to the Court's decision in *Nelson v. Bowler*. In that decision, the CCPA says that specific therapeutic use of a compound is not necessary if there are tests which evidence pharmacological activity of a compound. However, in this instance, pharmacological

activity is not the same as gene amplification. In *Nelson*, the court held that the compound of which utility was in question, was shown to have a specific pharmacological activity measured by dispositive tests. “In other words, one skilled in the art at the time the tests were performed would have been reasonably certain that 16-phenoxy PG’s had practical utility.” (885). “Here, however, a correlation between test results and pharmacological activities has been established.” (886) Unlike in *Nelson*, the instant application does not have a showing of practical utility. There are no test results to correlate the presence of PRO290 polypeptide with a diagnostic for lung or colon cancer. It is maintained that the instant application has not established the use of a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:33 and utility as a cancer diagnostic. A finding of amplification of the genomic nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO:32 cannot be assumed to correlate to the higher expression of the encoded polypeptide in the same tissues.

In the paragraph bridging pages 6-7, Appellants also cite *Cross v. Iizuka* (Fed. Cir. 1985), arguing that *in vitro* testing of a pharmaceutical was sufficient to support use *in vivo*. The argument has been fully considered, but is not persuasive. At issue is **not** whether *in vitro* amplification data can *per se* support use of differential expression for diagnostic purposes. The issue in this application is whether genomic DNA levels correlated with encoded protein levels.

Beginning on the bottom of page 9-10, Appellants refer to the declaration of Dr. Goddard, submitted on August 2, 2005. Appellants quote from p. 3 of the declaration as giving an expert opinion that a 2-fold increase in gene copy number in a tumor sample relative to a non-tumor sample is significant and useful. Appellants conclude that one skilled in the art would consider the 2.297-fold to 4.2-fold amplification of the gene encoding PRO290 in 5 lung tumors significant and credible based upon the facts in the Goddard declaration. This has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. In assessing the weight to be given expert testimony, the examiner may properly consider, among other things, the nature of the fact sought to be established, the strength of any opposing evidence, the interest of the expert in the outcome of the case, and the presence or absence of factual support for the expert’s opinion. See Ex parte Simpson, 61 USPQ2d 1009 (BPAI 2001), Cf. Redac Int’l. Ltd. v. Lotus Development Corp., 81 F.3d 1576, 38 USPQ2d 1665 (Fed. Cir. 1996), Paragon Podiatry Lab., Inc. v. KLM Lab., Inc., 948 F.2d 1182, 25 USPQ2d 1561, (Fed. Cir. 1993). In the instant situation, the nature of the fact sought to be established is whether or not a 2.297- to 4.2-fold amplification of the gene encoding

PRO290 in five lung tumors is significant and credible. Credibility has never been questioned. However, the significance can be questioned since 14 out of 19 lung tumor (6/11 SqCCa-type tumors) and 15/17 colon tumor samples did *not* show an amplification of the gene encoding PRO290, and the control used was not a matched non-tumor lung or colon sample, respectively, but rather was a pooled DNA sample from blood of healthy subjects. As discussed above, the art uses matched tissue samples. Pennica et al., Konopka et al., Sen et al., Hittelman et al., Godbout et al. and Li et al. speak to the strength of the opposing evidence as discussed in the rejections and response above. The expert has an interest in the outcome of the case since Dr. Goddard is listed as an inventor and is employed by the assignee. Finally, the expert refers to three publications as factual support for the conclusions in the declaration. However, neither Livak et al. nor Heid et al. appear to indicate that an approximately 2-fold amplification of genomic DNA is significant in tumors. Pennica et al. was found to support the rejection, as discussed above. Finally, while the Goddard declaration speaks to the utility and enablement of genes, it does not speak to whether or not the encoded proteins thereof are found at increased levels in cancerous tissues, but about significance for gene amplification data. Since the claims under examination are directed to polypeptides not genes, this question is critical. Based on consideration of the evidence as a whole, the rejection is proper.

Appellants characterize (pages 11-12) Pennica et al. as being limited to WISP genes and not speaking to the correlation of gene amplification and mRNA or protein expression for genes in general. Appellants characterize Konopka et al. as being limited to the *abl* gene, and not speaking to genes in general. Appellants do not need absolute certainty for an asserted use, but only that it is more likely than not that the product has that use. "The fact that in the case of a specific class of closely related molecules there seemed to be no correlation with gene amplification and the level of mRNA/protein expression, does not establish that it is more likely than not, in general, that such a correlation does not exist." This has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. Both Pennica et al. and Konopka et al. are relevant even though they are not reviews of gene amplification for genes in general, because they show a lack of correlation between gene amplification and gene product overexpression for particular genes. The instant case also concerns a single gene. Pennica et al. showed that 2/3 WISP gene levels did not correlate with mRNA levels. Konopka et al. showed that protein levels for the *abl* gene

were due to variation in mRNA levels not gene amplification. Moreover, the rejection is based on more evidence than just Pennica et al. and Konopka et al. (see, for example, Godbout et al. and Li et al, discussed below). The evidence of record indicates that (1) gene amplification does not reliably correlate with increased mRNA levels (Pennica et al., Konopka et al.), and (2) no evidence has been brought forth regarding levels of PRO290 mRNA or polypeptide levels in cancerous tissue. Finally, Pennica et al. provide evidence that closely related WISP genes show unpredictable gene amplification, mRNA and polypeptide levels. As discussed in the rejections above, these references are pertinent to the lack of reasonable expectation that for any given gene the level of gene copy number will correlate with protein expression.

Appellants argue (p. 12) that PRO290 was never claimed to be similar to DDX1 of Godbout et al., nor that it was an RNA helicase or confers a selective advantage to cell survival. However, Godbout shows a good correlation between protein levels and genomic DNA amplification. Structure/function data is not a requirement for the utility requirement. The argument has been fully considered, but is not persuasive. Appellants have missed the point of Godbout et al., which is that only those genes which confer a selective advantage to cell survival, for example a RNA helicase (though there are many other types of genes which could confer a selective advantage), would reasonably be expected to be amplified and have a correlative increase in encoded protein. The Examiner cannot find any reason to suspect that the protein encoded by the PRO290 gene would confer any selective advantage on a cell expressing it. On page 21167, right column, first full paragraph, Godbout et al. state, "It is generally accepted that co-amplified genes are not overexpressed unless they provide a selective growth advantage to the cell (48, 49). For example, although ERBA is closely linked to ERBB2 in breast cancer and both genes are commonly amplified in these tumors, ERBA is not overexpressed (48). Similarly, three genes mapping to 12q13-14 (CDK4, SAS and MDM2) are overexpressed in a high percentage of malignant gliomas showing amplification of this chromosomal region, while other genes mapping to this region (GADD153, GL1, and A2MR) are rarely overexpressed in gene-amplified malignant gliomas (50, 51). The first three genes are probably the main targets of the amplification process, while the latter three genes are probably incidentally included in the amplicons." There is no evidence in the instant application that PRO290 confers any growth advantage to a cell, and thus it cannot be presumed that the mRNA or protein is overexpressed



even if the genomic DNA is amplified. Godbout et al. support the unpredictability that for any particular amplified genomic DNA, the corresponding mRNA or protein will be overexpressed.

Appellants argue (top of page 13) that Li et al. acknowledge their results differed from those of Hyman et al. and Pollack et al. (of record), who found a substantially higher level of correlation between gene amplification and increased gene expression”, with Li et al. noting the difference may be from different methods used to study breast cancer and lung adenocarcinoma. Li et al. used a lower fold amplification threshold (1.40 compared to 2.0 in the instant application). The argument has been fully considered, but is not persuasive. Even if Li et al. used a lower amplification threshold, it was shown that a *significant majority* of genes that are amplified do not have overexpressed mRNA (p. 2633, col. 2, end of first paragraph):

In our study, 68.8% of the genes showing over-representation in the genome did not show elevated transcript levels, implying that at least some of these genes are 'passenger' genes that are concurrently amplified because of their location with respect to amplicons but lack biological relevance in terms of the development of lung adenocarcinoma.

Similarly, Hyman et al. found less than half (44%) of *highly* amplified genes showed mRNA overexpression (abstract). Polypeptide levels were not investigated. Like Hyman et al., Pollack et al. concentrated on large chromosome regions showing *high* amplification (p. 12965). Pollack et al. also noted contradictory results found by another research group, noting that, “Alternatively, the contrasting findings for amplified genes may represent real biological differences between breast and metastatic colon tumors; resolution of this issue will require further studies” (p. 12968, end of first paragraph). This leads again to the issue of unpredictability for any particular gene. PRO290 gene has not been asserted to be amplified in breast tumors. Both Li et al. and Hyman et al. show that less than half of the genes showing amplified DNA also showed elevated expression of mRNA. These references in combination with other references such as Godbout et al., Pennica et al. and Konopka et al. support a conclusion that one of skill in the art would not reasonably expect that for any particular amplified gene the corresponding mRNA or protein will more likely than not also be overexpressed.

Appellants argue ( middle of p.13 to the top of p.15) that Sen et al. supports the position that aneuploidy can be used to diagnose cancerous and precancerous tissue, as well as a means of

risk assessment and prognosis. Even if amplification of the PRO290 gene were due to aneuploidy, the art exemplified by Hittelman et al. supports the PRO290 gene as a useful marker for precancerous cells or damaged tissue that could later develop into cancer. Additionally, Hittelman et al. clearly says (p.2, ¶4, line 3), "First, it is important to identify individuals at significantly increased cancer risk who might best benefit from different types of intervention." The argument has been fully considered, but is not persuasive. In lung, the art shows that both cancerous and noncancerous lung tissue can be aneuploidy (see Sen et al. and Hittelman et al.). Also, in contrast to the art (*e.g.*, see Pennica et al., Konopka et al.), matched tissue samples were not used for controls in determining gene copy number in the instant application. Rather, the control DNA appears to have been isolated from blood (bottom of p. 547). Given these details, one skilled in the art would conclude that data were preliminary. Even though it is desirable to identify individuals at risk for cancer, the claimed invention cannot be used for that purpose. Because it is the PRO290 polypeptide and not the gene which is claimed, even if the reported amplification of the nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO:32 were due to aneuploidy, this does not support a diagnostic utility for the encoded polypeptide or antibody for the reasons previously discussed. The data pertaining to gene amplification do not convey utility to the claimed polypeptides, since amplification in genomic DNA as shown in the art fails to correlate with a corresponding increase in mRNA or polypeptide levels in many cases (see Pennica et al., Konopka et al., Godbout et al. and Li et al.).

In the middle of page 19 of the brief, Appellants argue that the Examiner improperly views the further testing described in the Ashkenazi declaration as further characterization of the PRO290 protein itself. Appellants assert that the experimentation described is only further characterization of the tumor not the polypeptide. Appellants argue that the PRO290 polypeptide is useful in tumor categorization, enabling the physician to select a treatment modality that holds the most promise for successful treatment of a patient. This has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. The tissue specific pattern of expression of a protein is definitely a feature of the protein itself. The determination of such is a form of characterizing the protein. Furthermore, no treatment modalities specific to PRO290 have been disclosed in the specification or prior art. The identification of such would require significant further research, thus also indicating that the asserted utility is not substantial.

In the paragraph bridging pages 19-20 of the brief, Appellants conclude by arguing that, based on the asserted utility for PRO290 in lung or colon cancer diagnosis, the reduction to practice of the protein of SEQ ID NO:33, the disclosure of protocols for making chimeric PRO polypeptides such as those claimed and for recombinant expression of PRO290, and the gene amplification assay in Example 170, the skilled artisan would know exactly how to make and use the claimed polypeptide for diagnosis of lung or colon cancers. Appellants urge that testing would have been routine and not undue. This has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. The rejection is supported by the preponderance of the evidence. Regarding the gene amplification assay itself, it is noted that the assay did not correct for aneuploidy, which is a common feature of noncancerous, damaged lung epithelium (evidenced by Sen et al.). The specification does not assert a utility for PRO290 as a biomarker for damaged, precancerous tissue, and such is not a well-established utility. Gene amplification publications used matched tissue controls, unlike Appellants (Pennica et al., Godbout et al., Li et al.). Contrary to Appellants' assertions, the state of the art indicates that gene amplification is not generally associated with overexpression of the encoded gene product, as evidenced by Sen, Pennica et al., Godbout et al., Hyman et al., and Li et al. The declaration setting forth the expert opinion of Dr. Ashkenazi contradicts the assertion of utility in the specification, wherein the specification indicates that gene amplification is associated with protein overexpression but Dr. Ashkenazi indicates that this is not always the case. Hanna and Mornin provide evidence that the level of polypeptide expression must be tested empirically to determine whether or not the polypeptide can be used as a diagnostic marker for a cancer. The specification does not provide data as to whether or not the polypeptide level of PRO290 was tested in normal and cancerous tissue, and thus the skilled artisan must perform additional experiments, as directed by the art. Since significant further research would have been required of the skilled artisan to reasonably confirm the PRO290 polypeptide is overexpressed in any cancer to the extent that it could be used as cancer diagnostic agent, the asserted utility is not substantial. Even more research would be required of the skilled artisan to determine if the claimed PRO290 polypeptides could be used as a cancer therapeutic, since there is no evidence that PRO290 plays a role in cancer formation or progression such that inhibiting PRO290 would result in effective cancer therapy. In the absence of information regarding whether or not PRO290 polypeptide levels are also different between

Art Unit: 1646

specific cancerous and normal tissues, the proposed use of the PRO290 polypeptides as diagnostic markers and/or therapeutic target is simply a starting point for further research and investigation into potential practical uses of the claimed polypeptides.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

**(12) Oral Hearing**

It does not appear that Appellants have requested an oral hearing at this time. However, if an oral hearing is requested, the Examiner requests the opportunity to present arguments at the hearing.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Claire Kaufman/

Patent Examiner, AU 1646

Conferees:

/Gary B. Nickol /

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1646

/Janet L. Andres/

Art Unit: 1646

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1625